



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## OPEN LETTERS.

### On a new code of nomenclature.

[In a private letter to one of the editors Dr. Kuntze asks that the following extract from it be printed in the BOTANICAL GAZETTE. It was called forth by the editor's explanation that the Madison Congress did not consider itself an international body, and that American botanists were trying to arrange certain rules of nomenclature for their own guidance, which would very likely be given as recommendations to any International Congress considering the subject.—Eds.]

I am surprised to learn from your letter that the American botanists are working out a new code of nomenclature. That will produce a schism between botanists, because the first code, that of Paris, can never be set aside or upset as Americans have partly done already. It can only be amended and augmented, and will be so maintained by conservative botanists in the future. Nomenclature in botany is more a matter of science, ancient customs and justice, than of convenience or convention; but has been treated by recent American botanists (Greene, Britton, etc.) more absolutely or nationally (that is, with no real convention for international science) than (as to their new propositions) with experience, learning and justice. I have already pointed out in my *Revisio Gen. Pl.* 3: [1] that only a few of these propositions are acceptable with the condition for future not retroactive action. Afterwards, in the last meeting of the A. A. A. S., they made more propositions, which were mostly inconsistent, as I wrote you in my last letter. Now you assert in your letter that these inconsistencies of nomenclature are mere recommendations to an international congress, but as these recommendations have been meanwhile applied practically in American check lists, etc., such as the irrational application of the 1753 starting-point of nomenclature before a competent congress agreed to it, these inconsistencies and subversions of the Paris Code are no more recommendations but revolutions against the Paris Code.

The difference between English botanists, who often work against the Paris Code, and American botanists in this matter, seems to me only that the English do it without fixed principles, while the Americans do it partly with revolutionary or wrong principles. If the decisions of national or incompetent congresses are admitted we will never reach harmony in botanical nomenclature. I trust that no competent congress would agree to a new code, and the however obtained affirmation to an aberrant codification (see Genoa), or to a new code of an incompetent congress, would be a kind of humbug. A new code, moreover, would trouble the matter, and would deprive me of my rights as emendator of the Paris Code. I hope the American botanists will avoid a schism, and avoid mistakes similar to those of the Genoa Congress.—DR. OTTO KUNTZE, *Capetown, January 21st.*